

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 97-1838

JERRY LEE GENT,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

RADFORD UNIVERSITY, The President and Dean of
the School of Social Work,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Abingdon. James P. Jones, District Judge. (CA-97-91-A)

Submitted: August 28, 1997

Decided: September 12, 1997

Before WILKINS, WILLIAMS, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jerry L. Gent, Appellant Pro Se. Maureen Riley Matsen, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Jerry Lee Gent appeals the district court's dismissal of his civil complaint for failure to state a claim. In Gent's complaint, he alleged that Radford University ("the University") denied his application for admission into a graduate studies program as a form of discrimination against him on the basis of his disability, in violation of both the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12132 (1994), and the Rehabilitation Act, 29 U.S.C. § 794 (1994). Gent also moves to compel the University to explain why female students in a specific graduate seminar outnumbered the male students. As relief, he moves for full-time admission into the University's graduate program, or in the alternative, for \$40,000 in compensatory damages.

We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. Gent v. Radford Univ., No. CA-97-91-A (W.D. Va. June 19, 1997). Further, we deny Gent's motions to compel an explanation from the University regarding the gender composition of one of its graduate seminars and we deny Gent's motion for remand, injunctive relief, or compensatory damages. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED